

Remarks

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-40 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-13, 16, 17, 21, 22, 30, 31, 34-37, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,603,488 (hereinafter "Humpleman").

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Gagnon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,522,342 (hereinafter "Gagnon").

Claims 14, 15, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Pollack et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,578,025 (hereinafter "Pollack").

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Pollack further in view of Gagnon.

Claims 29, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Gagnon further in view of Pollack further in view of Boreczky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,366,296 (hereinafter Boreczky).

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Boreczky further in view of Pollack.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 25, 39, 40 to more particularly define the invention. No new subject matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported and justified by the specification. Claims 15 and 24 are canceled without prejudice. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention, as defined by independent claims 1, 38, 39, and 40, is directed towards customizable presentation environments, a service broker system, and a method in which an interactive presentation of data uses a plurality of object placeholders. Each of the object placeholders holds either a presentable object (e.g., an image or icon) or a presentable reference to an object. The presentable objects are linked to one another to indicate the relationship between the respective objects. That is, each object has a pointer that refers to each of the presentable objects adjacent thereto. The presentable objects are displayed on a presentable environment

based on the way the objects are linked using this pointer arrangement.

Independent claims 1, 39, and 40 are allowable over Humpleman

Humpleman refers to displaying icons corresponding to devices on a display. Humpleman also mentions that "a user may arrange the device images 602 and associated logos 604 in groups according to the respective home device's placement in a home, e.g., on a room by room basis" (col. 14, lines 23-26). However, Humpleman fails to show or suggest at least linking the images and/or logos to each other using pointers to point to adjacent images and/or logos. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 39, and 40 are allowable over Humpleman.

Independent claim 38 is allowable Humpleman in view of Boreczky further in view of Pollack

Like Humpleman, Pollack and Boreczky also fail to show at least linking presentable objects to each other using pointers to point to adjacent presentable objects. Although Pollack does disclose the use of doubly-linked lists as a data structure, Pollack fails to show or suggest anything related to

the use of those doubly-linked lists (or any other type of pointer-based data structure) in defining the arrangement of presentable objects in a presentation environment. Thus, whether taken alone or in combination, Humpleman, Pollack, and Boreczky fail to show each element of applicants' independent claim 38. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 38 is allowable over Humpleman in view of Boreczky further in view of Pollack.

Dependent claims 2-14, 16-23, and 25-37 are allowable

Independent claim 1 is allowable. Dependent claims 2-14, 16-23, and 25-37 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-14, 16-23, and 25-37 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the forgoing, claims 1-14, 16-23, and 25-40 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Alexander Shvarts
Registration No. 47,943
Attorney for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090